

2016

Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1973-1976): Report 02

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_15

Recommended Citation

"Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1973-1976): Report 02" (2016). *Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1973-1976)*. Paper 2.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_15/2

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arts and Humanities: Reauthorization (1973-1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

State Humanities Programs

For the first time since enactment of the Arts and Humanities legislation in 1965, there is specific language included for a State Humanities program. In the past the Committee has urged the Humanities Endowment to formulate such a program. In 1975 the Endowment reported that there were State programs in all 50 States. Accordingly, S. 1800 introduced by the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator Pell and co-sponsored by Senator Javits, contained a legislative provision aimed at giving legislative authority to these programs, and at giving the States themselves the opportunity to develop their own programs in answer to their own desires and needs.

The Committee points out that the State program for the Humanities is presently conducted through committees in each State and that the leadership of these committees emanates through appointment from Washington and the Humanities Endowment, rather than emanating from the States themselves. In turn, the committee leaders and chairmen are responsible for the selection of committee members.

In contrast, from ^{its} ~~the~~ outset in 1966, the States arts program has emanated from the States, with chairmen and members of State arts councils appointed by the Governors of the States involved.

State Humanities committees conduct programs in accordance with specific themes related to particular subject areas in a given year. In contrast, State arts programs are not restricted to such themes and thus ~~have~~ are responsive to a wide variety of application each year.

The Committee recognizes ~~that~~ the meritorious quality of State Humanities programs, as well as the caliber of leadership involved. However, it believes that the States themselves should have the determining voice in the development of State programs.

Therefore the bill provides for a phase-in of State leadership in cases where State committees continue to function. After a three year period dating from enactment of the legislation, a majority of committee members will be gubernatorially appointed. The legislation also provides for federal funding by the Endowment of existing ~~combined~~ State agencies which in eleven States combine the Arts and Humanities within one entity. The bill also allows for States to create a new entity exclusively for the Humanities. Among these three options one ~~entity~~ agency or committee must be designated as the sole agency for support by the National Endowment for the Humanities under this Act.

The funding formula follows precisely that applicable to the State arts program, with initial bloc grants prescribed at a minimum of \$200,000 annually.

The Committee looks forward to increased grass roots impact of the Humanities program. It remembers that in the early days, when the enabling legislation was under consideration, the Humanities community provided the inspiration and national impact which were primarily responsible for bringing the overall legislation into reality.

Over the years the programs of the Arts Endowment appear to have surpassed in impact those of the Humanities. The Committee believes that much of this increasing impact of the Arts is attributable to the marked success of the State arts programs. This report has earlier mentioned the 15-fold increase in State funding for the arts in ten years, since the legislation creating the State-federal partnership was enacted. In addition, the Committee points to and commends closely related developments in the growing priorities municipalities are placing on the arts as reported in the hearings, ~~on the development of~~ and the development of community arts centers especially for the underprivileged and economically deprived, as well as the dramatic growth of community arts councils from less than 100 to more than 1,000 in ten years.

These developments serve to underscore the worth of the federal investment in the Arts. It is hoped that results indicating a like impact of the Humanities program can subsequently be reported. The Committee believes that the legislation it is reporting will help to make this possible, both at the State and community level and with respect to the innovative Bicentennial Era challenge program for the Humanities Endowment described below in this report.